



# UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE  
United States Patent and Trademark Office  
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS  
P.O. Box 1450  
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450  
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
-----------------	-------------	----------------------	---------------------	------------------

10/582,602

06/30/2006

Fumihiko Akahoshi

701019

2195

23460

7590

04/17/2008

LEYDIG VOIT & MAYER, LTD  
TWO PRUDENTIAL PLAZA, SUITE 4900  
180 NORTH STETSON AVENUE  
CHICAGO, IL 60601-6731

EXAMINER

JARRELL, NOBLE E

ART UNIT

PAPER NUMBER

1624

MAIL DATE

DELIVERY MODE

04/17/2008

PAPER

**Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.**

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

<b>Office Action Summary</b>	<b>Application No.</b> 10/582,602	<b>Applicant(s)</b> AKAHOSHI ET AL.	
	<b>Examiner</b> Noble Jarrell	<b>Art Unit</b> 1624	

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

### Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

### Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 26 March 2008.
- 2a) ☐ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☒ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

### Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1-7 and 11-16 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) 5 and 6.11 is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 13-16 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☒ Claim(s) 1-4, 7 and 12 is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

### Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☐ The drawing(s) filed on \_\_\_\_\_ is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.  
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).  
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

### Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some \* c) ☐ None of:
- ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
  - ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. \_\_\_\_\_.
  - ☒ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

\* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

### Attachment(s)

- |  |   |
|--|---|
| 1) <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)            | 4) <input type="checkbox"/> Interview Summary (PTO-413)           |
| 2) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)   | Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____                                      |
| 3) <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/SB/08) | 5) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Informal Patent Application |
| Paper No(s)/Mail Date <u>9/1/06</u> .  | 6) <input type="checkbox"/> Other: _____                          |

## **DETAILED ACTION**

### ***Election/Restrictions***

1. Applicant's election with traverse of group I in the reply filed on 3/26/2008 is acknowledged. The traversal is on the ground(s) that group II should merged with group I. This is found persuasive because the examiner found that searching for all instances of variable p not burdensome. Thus, group I is merged with group II. However, the newly formed group is still considered distinct from catch-all group III, and the restriction between the newly merged group and the catch-all group is considered FINAL.

### ***Claim Objections***

2. Claims 1-4, 7, and 12 objected to because of the following informalities: they contain non-elected subject matter. Appropriate correction is required.

### ***Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 112***

3. The following is a quotation of the first paragraph of 35 U.S.C. 112:

The specification shall contain a written description of the invention, and of the manner and process of making and using it, in such full, clear, concise, and exact terms as to enable any person skilled in the art to which it pertains, or with which it is most nearly connected, to make and use the same and shall set forth the best mode contemplated by the inventor of carrying out his invention.

4. Claims 13-16 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, first paragraph, because the specification, while being enabling for the *in vitro* inhibition of DPP-IV, does not reasonably provide enablement for *in vivo* inhibition of DPP-IV, nor for the treatment of all disorders or conditions associated with glucagon-like peptide 1 (GLP-1). The specification does not enable any person skilled in the art to which it pertains, or with which it is most nearly connected, to make and/or use the invention commensurate in scope with these claims. Applicants only show the *in vitro* inhibition of DPP-IV (pages 60-61).

The factors to be considered in determining whether a disclosure meets the enablement requirements of 35 U.S.C. 112, first paragraph, have been described in *In re Wands*, 858 F.2d 731, 8 USPQ2d 1400 (Fed. Cir., 1988). The court in *Wands* states, "Enablement is not precluded by the necessity for some experimentation, such as

Art Unit: 1624

routine screening. However, experimentation needed to practice the invention must not be undue experimentation. The key word is 'undue', not 'experimentation'" (*Wands*, 8 USPQ2d 1404). Clearly, enablement of a claimed invention cannot be predicated on the basis of quantity of experimentation required to make or use the invention. "Whether undue experimentation is needed is not a single, simple factual determination, but rather is a conclusion reached by weighing many factual considerations" (*Wands*, 8 USPQ2d 1404). Among these factors are: (1) the nature of the invention; (2) the breadth of the claims; (3) the state of the prior art; (4) the predictability or unpredictability of the art; (5) the relative skill of those in the art; (6) the amount of direction or guidance presented; (7) the presence or absence of working examples; and (8) the quantity of experimentation necessary.

Consideration of the relevant factors sufficient to establish a *prima facie* case for lack of enablement is set forth herein below:

*(1) The nature of the invention and (2) the breadth of the claims:*

The claims are drawn to compounds composed of thiazole linked to a cyclohexyl ring through an alkyl-C(O) linker. Thus, the claims taken together with the specification imply that these compounds can treat a disorder associated with GLP-1.

*(3) The state of the prior art and (4) the predictability or unpredictability of the art:*

Deacon et al. (*Journal of Clinical Endocrinology and Metabolism*, **1995**, 80(3), 952-957, cited in IDS) shows that *in vivo* study of GLP-1 is needed (page 956). Knudsen et al. (*European Journal of Pharmacology*, **1996**, 318, 429-435) teach that inhibition of GLP-1 is effective against non-insulin dependent diabetes (page 434). However, even this treatment may not work because patients experienced tachyphylaxis when the drug was administered *in vivo*. This article further supports the idea that further *in vivo* testing is required. In addition, type I diabetes cannot be prevented because it is an inborn illness, and cannot be prevented consequently.

*(5) The relative skill of those in the art:*

One of ordinary skill in the art can replicate the assays described in examples 1 and 2 on pages 61-62.

Art Unit: 1624

*(6) The amount of direction or guidance presented and (7) the presence or absence of working examples:*

The specification has provided guidance for *in vitro* inhibition of DPP-IV and the treatment of non-insulin dependent diabetes.

However, the specification does not provide guidance for the prevention of GLP-1 associated disorders and the *in vivo* inhibition of DPP-IV.

*(8) The quantity of experimentation necessary:*

Considering the state of the art as discussed by the references above, particularly with regards to claims 13-16 and the high unpredictability in the art as evidenced therein, and the lack of guidance provided in the specification, one of ordinary skill in the art would be burdened with undue experimentation to practice the invention commensurate in the scope of the claims.

5. The following is a quotation of the second paragraph of 35 U.S.C. 112:

The specification shall conclude with one or more claims particularly pointing out and distinctly claiming the subject matter which the applicant regards as his invention.

6. Claims 15-16 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, second paragraph, as being indefinite for failing to particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter which applicant regards as the invention. What form of diabetes is being treated? Type 1 or type 2?

***Allowable Subject Matter***

7. The following is a statement of reasons for the indication of allowable subject matter:

The closest art is the structure with RN 855341-78-5, which would render compounds of the elected group obvious if it was entered into STN prior to the filing date of the application, which is 12/10/2004. However, the compound was entered into STN 15 July 2005.

Art Unit: 1624

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Noble Jarrell whose telephone number is (571) 272-9077. The examiner can normally be reached on M-F 7:30 A.M - 6:00 P.M. EST.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Mr. James O. Wilson can be reached on (571) 272-0661. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free). If you would like assistance from a USPTO Customer Service Representative or access to the automated information system, call 800-786-9199 (IN USA OR CANADA) or 571-272-1000.

/Noble Jarrell/  
Examiner, Art Unit 1624

**/James O. Wilson/  
Supervisory Patent Examiner, Art Unit 1624**